

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/024,809	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CRAIG, NANCY L.	
	<b>Examiner</b> David A. Lambertson	<b>Art Unit</b> 1636	

**All Participants:**

 (1) David A. Lambertson.

 (2) Harriet Strimpel.
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 23 October 2003
**Time:** 2 pm
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's attorney/agent was contacted regarding an indication in the response to the Election/Restriction requirement stating that the newly claimed subject matter necessitated the addition of two inventors. The statement set forth that the inventorship would be corrected in a request under 37 CFR § 1.48 in a subsequent filing. The examiner left a detailed message stating that said subsequent filing had not been received, and inquiring as to whether the request had been submitted and lost, or not submitted at all. Applicant's attorney/agent indicated in response that the correction to the inventorship had not been submitted, but stated that the correction would be forthcoming when the appropriate signatures were acquired. The examiner indicated with regret that an Office Action was necessary at this point in time in the interest of compact prosecution, and informed Applicant's attorney/agent that a rejection under 35 USC 102(f) was necessary in the absence of the indicated change in inventorship...